



#8

P-02/04

OFFICIAL

Application Serial No. ....09/396,701  
Filing Date ..... September 15, 1999  
Group Art Unit .....2152  
Examiner .....Prieto, Beatriz

### REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

The undersigned attorney respectfully requests an interview for Application No. 09/396,701. The intended purpose and content of the requested interview is as follows. I would like to discuss the prior art as it is applied to the currently pending claims. Particularly:

(1) Claim 1 includes:

an annotation server, coupled to the client computer, to . . .  
generate new annotations based on electronic mail  
messages received both in response to the sent electronic mail  
messages and not in response to the sent electronic mail  
messages,

The January 17 Office Action cites several portions of Hou (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313) and asserts that these portions teach generating a new annotation based on electronic mail messages received both in response to the sent electronic mail message and not in response to the sent electronic mail messages (see, ¶ 9, p. 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion - none of these cited portions (or any other portion of Hou) discloses or suggests generating new annotations based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages as claimed in claim 1. Hou does disclose that the annotation on annotation handler allows a user to select a desired segment of an annotation and make a new annotation which is a reply to this selected segment (see, col. 9, lines 14-24). However, this annotation on annotation handler allows a new annotation to be made that is a reply to a selected segment - nowhere does Hou disclose that this annotation on annotation handler can generate new

annotations based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages as claimed in claim 1. Analogous reasons apply to claims 6 and 37.

(2) Claim 13 includes:

generating an electronic mail message including . . .  
an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered;

Russell (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407), is asserted in the January 17 Office Action as disclosing an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered (see, ¶4, p. 6). The cited portion of Russell discusses various sub-programs executed by an application system or operating system within a personal computer (see, col. 16, lines 47-49). However, none of these various sub-programs in Russell disclose or suggest an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered, much less an electronic mail message including such an installation option, as claimed in claim 13.

(3) Claim 25 includes:

a module to generate an electronic mail message regarding the new annotation, the electronic mail message including . . .  
an identifier of a temporal range of the media content that the new annotation content is associated with, which corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the

beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message.

The January 17 Office Action asserted that Hou teaches (at col 6/lines 61-66, col 7/lines 1-3, col 8/line 61-63, and col 9), an identifier of a temporal range of the media content that the new annotation content is associated with, which corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message (see, ¶3, p. 2). The cited portions of Hou discuss annotations and annotation-related events (including time), as well as markers on a timeline indicating when actions were performed (e.g., when a mouse pointer is located at the same data object or no data object, when the individual is using the mouse pointer to draw lines, and when the individual is using the mouse pointer to gesture). However, none of these events or markers disclose or suggest an electronic mail message including an identifier of a temporal range of the media content as claimed in claim 25. Analogous reasons apply to claims 17 and 23.

  
Allan T. Sponseller (Reg. No. 38,318)

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
(Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)

EXT 15

MAR-30-2001 14:27

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

509-324-9256 / fax 509-323-8979 / www.lee-hayes.com

P. 01/04

lee & hayes, pllc, intellectual property law

401 west riverside avenue, suite 500, spokane, washington 99201



**Fax Cover Sheet**

**Date:** 3/30/01

**To:** Examiner Beatriz Prieto  
Group Art Unit 2152

**From:** Allan Sponseller

**Re:** Application No. 09/396,701

**Number of Pages including cover sheet:** 4

**Notes:**

See attached interview request.

This document and any attached documents are proprietary and confidential, and are intended only for the use of the parties named above. Use by any other party is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the documents to the address listed above.